

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 93 04:30:13 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #540
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 22 Dec 93 Volume 93 : Issue 540

Today's Topics:

 Let's step back a minute.
 Question about radio pirating... (3 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 21 Dec 93 13:02:06 CST
From: timbuk.cray.com!hemlock.cray.com!cherry10!dadams@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Let's step back a minute.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Guys! Gals!

Hold on! Step back and think about what is happening in this
silly argument.

It is called an "ambush."

It works like this. You find two newsgroups that are philosophically at
odds. You come up with an inflamitory post and post it to both groups.
(Like something about how the BSA should allow gays in and post it
to alt.~.motts and rec.org.scouting.) Then you sit back and watch the
two groups go to war and tear each other to bits.

Some people really enjoy this.

It never solves anything. It only wastes bandwidth.

Why keep it up? At least remove alt.radio.pirate from the follow-up line!
Otherwise we only invite all these rebels to come on over and have a brawl.

(maybe I should cross post a note to talk.politics.guns saying something about
how amateur radio is not about hunting ducks. ;^)

Sourdough and Ham KG0IO

--David C. Adams internet: dadams@cray.com
Statistician uunet: uunet!cray!dadams
Cray Research Inc. packet: kg0io@tcman.#msp.mn.usa.noam

Experience --> Identify --> Analyze --> Generalize

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1993 08:00:07 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Question about radio pirating...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Geez Dana, I haven't left for Tahoe yet! Editorializing? Here's what Bly said:

In article <1993Dec14.172513.3952@btree.uucp> bly@btree.uucp (Roger Bly) writes:
>In article <igZ8Dc2w165w@p-cove.UUCP> wolfman@p-cove.UUCP (Aaron Smith) writes:
>>...
>>would be very easy for people to use the air waves illegally then...
>
>
>Very easy. In LA a growing number of people are using bogus ham calls.
>Some change their call every week, others stick with the same one.
>If you don't piss people off, no one will bother you. If your counter-
>culture or jam, someone might come looking. So you need to use some
>evasive "pirate" tactics.
>
>Pirate operation on HAM freqs in Southern Cal is rarely challenged by
>hams or the FCC. I did it for years.
>
>Roger Bly (ka6mwt)
>bly@brooktree.com

Sounds to me like he's giving advise on how not to get caught. I take that
as condoning illegally operating without a license.

Stand by for what Shoupe stated about his 5kW xmtr on the ham bands.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Mon, 20 Dec 1993 08:31:47 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: Question about radio pirating...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Continuing... 3 articles ago Dana accused me of editorializing. So,
Here you go Dana; just to refresh your memory:

In article <2esjspINNt4p@dtix.dt.navy.mil> shoupe@order.dt.navy.mil writes:
> In an earlier article, part of what I wrote:

>>No more outlaw activity, understand? We won't stand for it.
>
> I could care less if you stand/don't stand for anything. As for
>xmitters, I have two solid state 5kw am broadcast units I converted
>to the ham bands. Speech processing by Orban opti-mod AM. It will
>be the best sounding rig on the ham bands.

Did I editorialize? I don't believe so. He didn't mention reducing
the power on those xmtrs; in fact, I suspect he might use them for
broadcasting purposes, not 2-way communications (not too many AM'ers
left to talk to). That would be in line with his previous pirate
broadcasting days.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Wed, 22 Dec 1993 01:49:22 GMT
From: news.cerf.net!megatek!jimc@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Question about radio pirating...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Code, No-code, Ham, CBer, 11mtrs, 2mtrs, total anarchy, Orwellian gov...

I'm thinking about starting up a "DECAF" fund. Those that can't afford
decaf could maybe apply for some decaf packets. Others could contribute the
decaf for our less fortunate friends (It *is* the holiday season...)

Just a (maybe politically correct) thought...
-jim

--
Jim Campbell "The Tye-Dye Guy" | "Remember to tweet!"
jimc@megatek.com | You have just read the
WB6ZPB NSS#36691 ASA TNS | mother of all sig files.

Date: Tue, 21 Dec 1993 19:38:14 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!usc.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CIDr66.61B@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2f7e7gINN3od@abyss.west.sun.com>,
<1993Dec21.190612.1912@cs.brown.edu>ast
Subject : Re: Question about radio pirating...

In article <1993Dec21.190612.1912@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael
P. Deignan) writes:

>
>Dana, please spare us the vocabulary semantics.
>
>The generic, everyday use of the term "incarcerated" is used to mean
>someone who is jailed for an offense.

I would say this does *NOT* mean the person has to be indicted, tried,
convicted, and sentenced. I hold that they only had to be "arrested" (or
whatever you call it) on *supision* (sorry about spelling) of the crime.

--
Will Turner, NORDV -----
wjturner@iastate.edu | "Are you going to have any professionalism, |
twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu | or am I going to have to beat it into you?" |
TURNERW@vaxld.ameslab.gov -----

Date: 21 Dec 1993 18:01:28 GMT
From: news.service.uci.edu!usc.edu!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!sgiblab!
sgigate.sgi.com!olivea!korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!
myers@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CICs5C.Gy5@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <2f5hjgINN36l@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,

<CIDnwy.4yC@news.Hawaii.Edu>i.c
Subject : Re: Question about radio pirating...

In article <CIDnwy.4yC@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:
>In article <2f5hjgINN36l@abyss.West.Sun.COM> myers@cypress.West.Sun.COM writes:
>>
>>Well, #1, Mike Shoupe is not an outlaw.
>>
>>As far as I can tell, Shoupe said "I've got a 5KW transmitter I've
>>converted to the ham bands". He did not suggest that he will run
>>excessive power, he did not suggest he would engage in broadcasting,
>>he did not say which frequencies he plans to operate, and you started
>>calling him an outlaw!
>
>Geez, it's no wonder why 2 meters in Southern California is such a
>mess; I guess the blind ultra-liberal type of thinking Californians
>are so proud of has found its way to the ham bands.

Well, since you want to make it personal, Jeff:
Hmmm... I didn't know the blind-ultra-fascist-hang-em-without-a-trial
type of thinking dictators are so proud of has found its way to Hawaii.
Maybe you ought to study civil rights and due process before you
start calling people outlaws.

>Shoupe is an admitted law breaker - he stated he ran a pirate radio
>station - thus he broke federal law - that's why I've referred to
>him as an outlaw. Has the statute of limitations run out for him?
>Probably not. Therefore, the feds could come knocking on his door
>tomorrow and arrest him for his crimes. But in your eyes he's done
>no wrong.

Don't be a dolt. You can't see through my eyes, you don't know how
I think, and you refuse to understand. Shoupe *says* he once ran a
pirate radio station; without other evidence, I'd have a hard time
convicting him of a crime. Do you get it, Jeff? In my eyes, I haven't
seen the evidence required to declare Shoupe a criminal. Can you see
that Jeff? I'm not the ultra-liberal you accuse me of; I consider myself
a moderate, and I try to see the big picture before I convict people.
But, no, Jeff is ready to through due process out the window and be a
complete fascist amateur radio weenie. Wonderful.

By the way, you seem to know nothing but what you've been told about
Southern California radio. I use 2m in Southern California, and it
is not the mess you would like to portray it as. Yes, there are repeaters
that are largely populated by controversial types, Yes, there are people
that break the rules, yes, in an area with 10 million people 2m is
congested in some places. However, I have 12 amateur channels programmed

in my Motorola that are *not* congested or jammed, so what the heck is your point?

>Dana, do the criminals in your state a favor: become a judge! :)

Since you want to make it personal, Jeff, and since you are unable to discuss things intellectually before you launch into personal attacks, etc., chew on this:

Jeff, do the innocent people on Usenet a favor: don't become a judge! Leave the "outlaw" rhetoric alone! Just go back to posting yet more QRP transmitters to rec.radio.amateur.homebrew.

>Alright Gang, I'm on my way to the airport for 3 weeks of snow
>(we never see that stuff here in Hawaii except up on Mauna Kea
>at the 15,000 foot level); I hope you all have a very very
>wonderful Christmas or Hanukkah; please drive safely.

Enjoy yourself in Tahoe; I'll be a couple of hours drive away, in case you want to get together and call me ultra-liberal to my face :-). Leave me a voice mail note at (310) 348-6043 with a number to reach you.

Dana

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer *
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: 21 Dec 1993 21:40:10 GMT
From: olivea!korie!newscast.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!sunspot!
myers@uunet.uu.net
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2f3jdpINN2v3@abyss.West.Sun.COM>,
<1993Dec21.150001.23904@cs.brown.edu>, <1993Dec21.154912.10325@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>s
Subject : License reform (was Re: The 10-meters band - No CW required ?

In article <1993Dec21.154912.10325@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <1993Dec21.150001.23904@cs.brown.edu> md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu
(Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>>myers@sunspot.West.Sun.COM writes:

>>

>>> If I hadn't read it myself, I wouldn't have believed it. I happen

>>> to support much the same proposal. This simplifies the testing quite
>>> a bit.

>>

>>I don't think I've ever posted a message claiming the existing licensing
>>structure was adequate, so I don't know why you're surprised by my post.
>>In fact, my constant blasting of the inefficient VEC system should in
>>fact offer a clue as to what I really think of the licensing system.
>>There is no reason to have 6 license classifications with a myriad of
>>operating privs. KISS.

>Damn! I like this plan too. While I think it still gives too much
>weight to Morse testing, I can live with it because of the treaties.
>I think to make it fly we have to grandfather the current Techs into
>full class B status though. That was the problem with Incentive licensing
>back in 68, it didn't grandfather existing licensees, and that created
>a lot of bad will that continues to this day.

I tend to agree with Gary on this. Particularly since we've already
been through the incentive licensing change and some people remember
the loss of earned privileges, it is probably important to the
success of a licensing reform proposal to not strip existing licensees
of current privileges. This issue is thorny. I myself have no problem
with a 10WPM CW test, however, the current licensing structure doesn't
have such a test. Evolutionary changes are often easier to get approved
than revolutionary changes, so the question keeps coming back "How
do we map the existing system into a new one?".

Combining the existing question pools into one which an expanded written
exam is pulled from seems to make sense; this would make the pool something
like 1500 questions, which is too big to memorize for most people. I
would suspect that a combined written exam would tend to emphasize
all rules/regs over theory. This isn't so bad; it might make people
read part 97 before they get licensed. How do we grandfather existing
licensees?

Well, it may be the case that a combined written exam would map
into percentages of existing Novice, Tech, General, Advanced and
Extra questions, at least for some time. Then, existing licensees
would be given some grace period to continue operating until they had
passed the portions of the combined exam that correspond to the higher
classes. This sounds ugly, but would only be an issue for an interim
period, after which we could lose knowledge of novice vs tech vs general...

But the CW issue comes back. Obviously, General, Advanced and Extra
would get credit for a 10WPM test; if 5WPM were to be used, then
Novices and coded Techs of any vintage would get credit. Probably we
would again use a grace period for existing licensees to meet an
increased standard.

In summary, I would generally suggest that increased standards for the same privileges would need to provide a grace period, probably not to exceed the term of one's current license with an absolute sunset date 10 years after the enactment of the reform, for existing licensees to upgrade. This is a regulatory issue much like the current Technician issue, where the same class of license has different privileges depending on when the person got the license or whether he passed a CW test.

Comments?

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD 466 | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily *
* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer *
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #540

